| S SEAT, UMPNT — | | |
|--------------------|-------|-----|
| N CALLY FILED | | |
| , 1.1) | 10/12 | 111 |

SCANNED

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

CHIKEZIE OTTAH

CASE NO. 1:10-cv-07296-CM

PLAINTIFF

[JUDGE COLLEEN MCMAHON]

VS

1st MOBILE TECHNOLOGIES

Date: 10/04/2011

Dear Judge Colleen McMahon

Thank you for given us opportunity to decide if Markman hearing is necessary to clarify that FMT have infringe on my patent, I was in communication with FMT counsel Mr. Joshua A. Lorentz (on the phone and e-mails) until they release their decision on September 30th 2011.

FMT Position:

Markman hearing is not necessary

Defendant Request For Answer:

The defendant answer to my 2nd amended complaint suggest he need clarity to understood the patent infringement action against his company. Example, page 1, numbers 4, 5, and 6 of defendant's answer to my second amended complaint denies FMT product (s) infringes on patent US 7,152,840.

Further reason to believe the defendant need clarity is in page 2, numbers 7, 8, 9 and 10 of his affirmative defense, see page 2 of defendant's answer to my second amended complaint with defenses and counterclaims. (A copy is attached).

Markman Hearing

Therefore, to prove the case of patent infringement with clarity, the defendant deserve the right to hear and read the answers to those issues and concerns he raised in pages 1 and 2 of defendant's answer to my second amended complaint with defenses and counterclaims, answered with clarity.

I have in my last affirmation in opposition to motion to dismiss, named, a respond to the memorandum, dated April 13, 2011 informed the court that I have the same patent in other country (s) and I intend to introduce the patent for clarity.

Sincerely Chikezie Ottah

10/12/2011

Mose White Mr. Ottah Con teads in conclusory

Mashim that there is no need for a Mark mar Learny,

fashim that there is no need for a Mark mar Learny,

for the open of the sum why this is so - he

prosess no substantive reason why this is so - he

prosess no substantive reason while the partie of the.

PRO SE OFFICE

So
ident his no claim term over while the partie of the summary of set by

ident his no claim term over while the summary of set by

ident his no claim term over while the schedule premary of the court. If in the coviet

Therefore, defendant shell file a motion for summary of the court. If in the coviet

prospore, defendant shell file a motion for schedule premary of the court.

Copies mailed / faxed/handed to counsel on 10/12/1

becomes approach